



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

POETASTER AND SATIROMASTIX, edited by Josiah H. Penniman. The Belles-Lettres Series. Boston. D. C. Heath and Company. 12mo., pp. lxx, 456. 1913.

It was a happy idea to bring into one volume *Poetaster* and *Satiromastix*. Neither play can be properly studied without the other; and a knowledge of both is essential to an understanding of "that terrible Poetomachia" which so profoundly disturbed the dramatic world during the later years of Elizabeth's reign. *Poetaster*, it is true, has long been accessible in more than one satisfactory edition, but hitherto *Satiromastix* has been inaccessible to most readers; it has, indeed, been properly edited only once, by Dr. Hans Scherer in Bang's *Materialien*. In placing an accurate text of these two plays within the easy reach of all students, Professor Penniman has rendered a valuable service to the study of the Tudor drama.

In addition to the texts, the volume contains a short Biography of each of the two playwrights, a long Introduction on the War of the Theatres, elaborate Notes, and a Glossary. But to this editorial work, I regret to say, unstinted praise cannot be given; the volume has too many faults, both of commission and of omission, to satisfy the highest standard of scholarship.

For the purpose of testing the general accuracy of the editorial work, I selected the Biography of Dekker, in the main a catalogue of Dekker's numerous dramatic and non-dramatic works. The first paragraph of this catalogue (p. ix) I checked up with Henslowe's *Diary*, on which it is supposedly based, and discovered the following errors:

Four plays are entirely omitted: *Wars of Henry I*, 1598, with Chettle and Drayton; *Pierce of Winchester*, 1598, with Drayton and Wilson; *Second Hannibal and Hermes*, 1598, with Drayton, and *Fair Constance of Rome*, Part II, with Drayton, Hathaway and Munday.

The Golden Ass is wrongly attributed to Dekker, Munday, Drayton and Hathway. It was written in collaboration with Chettle and Day.

Of *Chance Medley* Professor Penniman says: "To this Chettle or Munday also contributed." There is no doubt as to Munday's share; he received 25 s. for the play. The doubt applies to Dekker himself. Mr. Greg says: "It is not clear whether it was Dekker or Chettle that was engaged on this piece."

The play called *Two Harpies*, (Malone's guess for Henslowe's indecipherable scrawl) Mr. Greg has identified as

“beyond doubt” *Caesar’s Fall*, and it should, perhaps, have been so entered.

Finally, the name of Chettle is omitted from the list of collaborators in the two parts of *Lady Jane Gray*, and in *Christmas Comes but Once a Year*.

The inaccuracies here noted do not inspire one with confidence; nor have I found painstaking accuracy an invariable characteristic of the editorial material. Professor Penniman seems to have made little use of Greg’s scholarly edition of Henslowe’s *Diary*. That he sometimes relied on unauthoritative sources is indicated elsewhere; for example, when, in his note to p. 325, ll. 275-6, he says, following Fleay: “*Gammer Gurton’s Needle*, a play by Bishop Still, was acted in 1562-63 at court, and at Cambridge in 1566”; and again when in his note to p. 349, l. 122, he says: “*Alexander and Lodowick*. The name of a play by Martin Slaughter.”¹

I have made no attempt to verify other statements contained in these two Biographies; yet in rapidly glancing over the account of Jonson, I observed that the duel with Spencer is wrongly dated 1599 (probably through a printer’s error); and the impression is given that this duel led to a permanent breach with Henslowe—at least the fact that in 1599 Jonson was again writing for the Admiral’s Men is omitted. Since at this time Marston and Dekker were also writing for the Admiral’s Men, and since Jonson was collaborating with Dekker, and possibly with Marston, the fact has special significance for the impending animosity of these playwrights.

But let us turn to Professor Penniman’s more serious labors—his Introduction, Texts, and Notes.

The Introduction fails to give what one would most naturally expect—a clear and well-ordered account of the War of the Theatres; instead, it leaves the reader confused and perplexed. A brief summary, based on the facts actually known, and narrating in a simple and straightforward manner the history of the quarrel between Jonson and the Poetasters, would be desirable in a work of this nature, intended for the college student and the general reader as well as for the scholar.

Professor Penniman spends most of his time in seeking to identify characters in various plays with real persons. In some cases, of course, the identification is patent enough—

¹ *Gammer Gurton’s Needle* was written by William Stevenson, and was acted at Christ’s College, first in 1553-4 according to Professor Bradley, in 1550-53 according to Professor Wallace; and again in 1559-60. There is no evidence that it was ever presented at court. Martin Slaughter was an actor and not a playwright.

even acknowledged by the authors. But Professor Penniman, like other scholars who have written on the subject, does not hesitate to indulge in the purest speculation. In many cases the evidence that he adduces to establish his identifications is trivial, and in some cases worse. Those who seek to prove that Bacon wrote the plays of Shakespeare, or that Mistress Davenant was the Dark Lady of the *Sonnets*, employ reasoning hardly less astonishing. For example, Samuel Daniel, who was so highly praised by Spenser, Barnfield, Lodge, Meres, and others, the tutor to William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, and to Lady Anne Clifford, whom Jonson himself described as "a good honest man," Professor Penniman identifies with Mattheo, the town gull in *Every Man in His Humour*, with Fastidious Brisk in *Every Man Out of His Humour*, with Hedon in *Cynthia's Revels*, with Gullio in *Parnassus*, and with Emulo in *Patient Grissel*. This remarkable series of identifications mainly hinges on the identification of the foolish Gullio, in *The Return from Parnassus*, Part I, with Daniel. In establishing this identification the editor makes much of the fact that Gullio is represented as a plagiarist, and he cites the Second Part of the *Return from Parnassus* as proof that Daniel was commonly thought to be a plagiarist. The passage referred to, however, serves rather to reveal the high opinion the author of the Parnassus plays had of Daniel, and to make quite improbable any attack upon him in the silly and contemptible character of Gullio:

Sweet hony dropping *Daniell* doth wage
 Warre with the proudest big Italian
 That melts his heart in sugred sonneting.
 Onely let him more sparingly make use
 Of others wit, and use his own the more
 That well may scorne base imitation.

The charge here may be that of "imitation" rather than plagiarism. But assuming that Daniel was known to be guilty of plagiarism, Professor Penniman adduces the following proof that Gullio was intended for Daniel: "Gullio quotes, as his own, lines from Shakespeare, and 'will runne through a whole booke of Samuel Daniell's.'" To me, however, the fact that when Gullio begins to quote, as his own, scraps of verse from well-known poets, the sarcastic Ingenioso remarks "I think he will runne through a whole booke of Samuel Daniell's," refutes the theory that Gullio was intended for Daniel. Does not the remark of Ingenioso really compliment Daniel in implying that his books were popular, and hence apt to be quoted? Let any one who is in doubt turn

to Macray's edition of *The Return from Parnassus* and read page 52, which introduces, and fully characterizes, the person of Gullio.

But Professor Penniman, having decided the identity of Gullio, remarks: "The identification of Gullio with Daniel fixes the identity of several other precisely similar characters"; and he then proceeds to establish these identifications. His arguments run like this: "Hedon keeps 'a barber and a monkey,' Gullio writes 'an epitaph on a [his mistress] monkey,'" etc. See pages xxxix-xl.

Jonson wrote his own protest against this, and I cannot do better than to let him speak for himself: "My works are read look into them where have I been particular? Where personal? except to a mimic, cheater, bawd, or buffoon, creatures, for their insolence, worthy to be taxed? I know that nothing can be so innocently writ or carried, but may be made obnoxious to construction Application is now grown a trade with many; and there are that profess to have a key for the decyphering of everything; but let wise and noble persons take heed how they be too credulous."²

In the case of *Satiromastix*, likewise, the temptation to discover real persons in the characters is stronger than scholars have been able to resist. Dekker is very explicit, and, apparently, absolutely sincere in his statement to his readers: "Thus much I protest (and sweare by the divinest part of true poesie) that (howsoever the limmes of my naked lines may bee, and I know have been, tortur'd on the racke) they are free from conspiring the least disgrace to any man, but onely to our new *Horace*." Yet Mr. H. C. Hart identifies the ignorant city gull, Asinius Bubo, with the poet Michael Drayton. Professor Penniman gives Mr. Hart's identification (pp. 400-401) apparently with approval—he refers to it often—certainly with no disapproval. Yet who can believe that these lines were intended to satirize "Draiton, diligent and formall"?—

Hor. Good Bubo, read some booke, and give us leave—

Asin. Leave have you, deare ningle. Marry, for reading any book, he take my death upont (as my ningle sayes) tis out of my element. No, faith, ever since I felt one hit me ith teeth that the greatest clarkes are not the wisest men, could I abide to goe to schoole; I was at *As in presenti* and left there: yet, because Ile not be counted worse foole than I am, Ile turne over a new leafe.

² Dedication prefixed to *Volpone*, 1607.

Or who can believe that when Sir Vaughan, at the end of the play, makes Bubo take the following oath as to his future conduct, he is referring to Drayton?—

You will not hyre Horace to give you poesies for rings, or handkerchers, or knives, which you understand not, nor to write your love-letters which you (in turning of a hand) set your markes upon, as your owne; nor you shall not carry Latin poets about you, till you can write and read English at most.

Is neither Dekker nor Jonson to be allowed to represent a gull without being accused of satirizing some eminent poet? For my part, I am willing to accept the statements of the playwrights, so earnestly made, until better evidence is advanced by those who attempt to prove the contrary.

After all, was not the War of the Theatres a much simpler thing than most scholars seek to make it? In the works of Samuel Daniel no one has yet been able to discover the slightest echo of this War. Jonson is very specific as to his share in it. He asserts that he took no notice of his enemies before he wrote his acknowledged reply in *Poetaster*:

Hor. I take no knowledge that they doe maligne me.

Tib. I, but the world takes knowledge.

And in his Apologeticall Dialogue, he reiterates the statement that *Poetaster* was his first answer to their attacks:

But sure I am, three yeeres
They did provoke me with their petulant styles
On every stage: And I at last, unwilling,
But weary, I confesse, of so much trouble,
Thought I would try if shame could winne upon 'hem,
And therefore chose Augustus Caesars times.

Dekker's share in the War was limited to *Satiromastix*. And a short time after the appearance of *Satiromastix*, both Marston and Dekker were on the best of terms with Jonson.

For his text of *Poetaster* Professor Penniman has wisely reproduced the folio of 1616. He has undertaken to give a faithful reprint, with certain minor exceptions to which no one can object. Since Jonson himself edited the folio of 1616 with great care, the importance of preserving the original spelling and punctuation is obvious. The editor has painstakingly collated several copies of the first folio, the quarto of 1602, and several copies of the folio of 1640, including the large-paper copy in the British Museum, and has conveniently recorded all variants in footnotes.

I have carefully compared ten pages of the reprint with copies of the 1616 and the 1640 folios in my own possession, without discovering a single error; and all the variants I

have found duly recorded. Unfortunately, however, the Induction and the Prologue were not so carefully printed. In these I noted the following errors:

P. 5, l. 1. After *thee* a semicolon for a comma.

P. 5, l. 11. After *stay* a colon for an exclamation.

P. 5, l. 14. After *not* the comma has been dropped; and the word *these* has been unnecessarily capitalized.

P. 5, l. 16. After *lights* the comma has been dropped.

P. 6, l. 22. *riffe* for *risse*.

P. 8, l. 12. *fence* for *sence*.

Satiromastix is printed from the only text, the quarto of 1602. The editor says: "As the quarto was carelessly printed, an attempt is made here to give a correct text, changes being indicated in the footnotes. Obvious misprints have been silently corrected and the punctuation modernized." The text, so far as I have been able to discover, has been reproduced with scrupulous accuracy; but the "modernized" punctuation is far from satisfactory. Although Professor Penniman has used the greatest freedom in altering the original punctuation and capitalization, he has done his work so half-heartedly that he has produced a text which, like Falstaff's otter, is neither fish nor flesh; it fails to reproduce the original, and it cannot be fairly described as a modernization. I cite a few illustrations:

293. 342. "By Jesu, within this hour, save you, Captayne Tucca." This should be: "By Jesu, within this hour. —Save you, Captayne Tucca." In the first clause, Horace promises Blunt to have the poem ready within an hour; in the second clause, he suddenly recognizes Tucca, who has just entered.

313. 48. "Away, and, stay: here be epigrams" This should be punctuated: "Away, and—Stay, here be Epigrams"

322. 183. "*Tuc.* Why well said, my nimble Short-hose." This punctuation spoils the sense. The first clause, "Why well said," was addressed to Mistress Miniver; the second clause, "My nimble Short-hose," was spoken aside to Short-hose. One could readily multiply examples, but the reader will find them on almost every page.

The Notes to *Poetaster* are full, and in the main scholarly. The play, it is true, had already been carefully edited by Whalley, Gifford, Cunningham, Nicholson, Mallory, and Hart, so that little matter of great importance could be added; but Professor Penniman has shown good judgment in selecting from different interpretations, and has added fresh material when he could. The Notes to *Satiromastix* are less satisfactory. This play, of course, had not received the careful

attention that had been given by many scholars to *Poetaster*. Professor Penniman, however, has corrected a number of errors made by Doctor Scherer, and has contributed many valuable notes of his own.

The inclusion of certain explanatory material in a Glossary at the end of the volume is a constant source of annoyance. For this, of course, the editor is not to blame; it is the fault of the series. Yet he has aggravated the annoyance by inserting in his Notes many words that logically should be in the Glossary; for example, 267.14; 273.48; 273.52; 273.64; 284.124; etc. Such inconsistency is hard to understand. And equally hard to understand is the failure of the editor to explain in the Glossary many words that clearly demand explanation. A few cases may be cited: 91.45 "minsitive," (the *N.E.D.* records this as the only occurrence of the word as an adjective, and records only one occurrence of the noun); 115.10 "everts" (which the *N. E. D.* describes as rare, and can give only two other occurrences); 383.164, "place-mouth"; 339.146, "scowring-sticke"; 370.61, "posted off"; 309.219, "repaires"; 328.340, "tall." The same thing is true, though to a less extent, of passages that call for explanatory notes. For example, 321.151-52: "She has a vizard in a bagge will make her looke like an angell," meaning, her wealth will transform her ugly face into that of an angel; 305.138-39: "above a hundred merie tales," referring to the popular jest-book of that name. Of course the standard of what is to be included and what excluded varies in different annotated editions; but I have kept in mind the standard that this particular volume sets for itself, and judged by its own standard, there are many omissions, in both the Notes and the Glossary.

Below are recorded some of the corrections and additions suggested by an examination of the Notes.

5.3. In giving references, the editor might well have recorded the article by W. J. Lawrence, *Title and Locality Boards on the Pre-Restoration Stage*, printed in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* for 1909 (xlv. 146), and subsequently reprinted in his *The Elizabethan Playhouse*.

10.5-6. *Songs and Sonnets*. "This was the title of Surrey's Poems 1557." To be exact, it was the title of Tottel's Miscellany, in which appeared poems not only by Surrey, but also by Wyatt, Grimald, Vaux, Heywood, Somerset, "and other," as the titlepage states. For "H. E. Hart" read "H. C. Hart." An apter reference than those noted is Master Slender, in Shakespeare's *Merry Wives* I. i.

11.33. *Pantilius Tucca*. For an interesting surmise as to the origin of this name, see Wm. Hand Browne, *Mod. Lang.*

Notes, 1905, xx. 216. Professor Browne's surmise is supported by a passage in *Lady Alimony* (Hazlitt's Dodsley, xiv. 284).

16.62. Tucca says of the players: "They forget they are i' the statute, they are blazond there, there they are trickt, they and their pedigrees; *they neede no other heralds, I wisse.*" The last clause the editor paraphrases thus: "The Statute describes players so clearly that no other description or announcement concerning their low position is needed." But obviously Tucca refers, not to an "announcer," but to the College of Herald; he means that the players need no other herald than the Statute to establish their pedigree. The Statute names the players along with fencers, bearwards, jugglers, pedlers, tinkers, and petty chapmen, and classifies them all as "rogues, vagabonds and sturdy beggars." Cf. *Histrion-Mastix*, III. 272. Philarchus says of the players: "Blush not the peasants at their pedigree?"

19.137. *sing with angels*. This is a punning reference to the fact that an angel was commonly called "the lawyer's fee." Thus Stubbes, discussing the lawyers in *The Display of Corruptions*, says: "It is no meruaile if they be rich and get much, when they will not speak two words under an angell (for that is called a counsellers fee)."

19.148. *Three bookes will furnish you*. In *Stukeley* (Simpson, *School of Shak.* I. 166) these are "Littleton, Stamford, and Brooke."

21.187. Tucca calls Ovid Senior "old stumpe." The editor thinks this may be "an allusion to the fact that the character was acted by a boy," or "to the fact that Ovid walked 'stiffly as an old man,' as Dr. Mallory suggests." The words "old stumpe" do not suggest either littleness or stiffness; probably Tucca is merely referring to the age of Ovid Senior.

23.227. *This chain*. The editor rejects Dr. Mallory's plausible suggestion that the chain worn by Ovid Senior was such as in Jonson's day were worn by aldermen and wealthy citizens. He contends that since Ovid Senior was a Roman, the reference is to the *torquis*, an ornament of twisted gold worn in classical times on the arm, attached to the breast, or less frequently about the neck. But Jonson's actors did not attempt to reproduce Roman costumes closely; note the hat and feather of Crispinus, the cap of Chloe with its silver bodkin, and the long description of contemporary woman's headdress. Jonson would hardly stickle on this point. On page 24, Tucca says to Ovid: "Jove Keepe thy chaine from pawning." This refers to the Elizabethan custom, so often mentioned in the drama, of men pawning their gold chains. As to the value of these chains, see *The Puritan*

Widow I. iv. 122-6: "Wilt soon at night steal me thy master's chaine? . . . I know it to be worth three hundred crowns."

43.107-10. I cannot agree with the editor's note on this passage. Johnson is merely satirizing the custom of certain persons in going to see plays for the purpose of storing up high-sounding phrases. The custom is often satirized; note *Cynthia's Revels* III. i: "O, that piece was excellent! If you could pick out more of these play-particles, and, as occasion shall salute you, embroider or damask your discourse with them, persuade your soul, it would most judiciously commend you."

66.1-3. It should be observed that the use of the terms "bloudhound," "mungrels," "cures," "bandogs," etc., applied to the lictors here and throughout the play, is based on the use of the cant term "dog," meaning "constable."

73.329. *Accommodate it unto the gentleman*. The editor remarks: "evidently an affected word." Jonson himself says as much in *E. M. I. H.* I. iv, and at the same time explains it: "Hostess, accommodate us with another bed-staff here quickly. *Lend* us another bed-staff—the woman does not understand the words of action."

88.396-402. In connection with this ridicule of Peele's *Battle of Alcazar*, it should be noted, that although originally produced "before 1589," the play was revived by the Admiral's Men shortly before *Satiromastix* was written, and hence was fresh in the minds of the audience. For the Plot of the revival, see Greg's *Henslowe Papers*, pp. 138-141. Much popular interest in the Battle of Alcazar was aroused in England about this time by the news of the appearance of a Pretender to the Portuguese throne, claiming to be King Sebastian who was slain in that famous battle. This interest is reflected in the revival of Peele's play, in the revival of *Stukeley*, in Munday's pamphlet *The Strangest News That Ever Happened* (1602), and in a new play by Dekker and Chettle entitled *Kinge Sebastian of Portugall* (1602).

105.11. The Banquet of the Gods was inspired by Lucian, rather than by Homer, although Jonson has borrowed from both. See *Mod. Lang. Notes*, January, 1912, vol. xxvii. p. 30.

152.343. *Thou motley gull*. Professor Penniman says: "i. e. Tucca." But it seems clear to me that Horace is addressing himself to Demetrius Fannius.

269.62. The editor's note indicates that he failed to understand the passage. Dekker means simply: "This play would not have appeared in print, had not," etc.

273.53. *lead apes in hell*. The best explanation of this difficult expression has been made by Prof. G. C. Moore Smith, in *Mod. Lang. Review*, April, 1904, vii. 6.

282.54-5. A glance at the horn joke.

282.71. Asinius refers to his pipe.

294.351. *Caine*. Tucca, addressing Asinius, makes a pun on "cane" tobacco.

296.415. *Gorboduck*. The editor thinks this a reference to the tragedy in the Senecan manner, written by Norton and Sackville, and acted by the lawyers in 1560. But it is far more likely that Tucca is referring to plays fresh in the minds of the audience. From Henslowe's *Diary* we learn that in 1600 Haughton wrote a play on the same theme, called *Ferrex and Porrex*. For the same reason I believe that Tucca's reference to *Damon and Pithias*, l. 406, is to Chettle's play written for Henslowe in 1600, rather than to the early play of the same name by Edwards, 1564.

296.419. *heyre apparant of Helicon*. The editor is wrong, I think, in supposing that Tucca refers to Jonson. The phrase is applied to Crispinus-Marston, "the new poet." Dekker pays him another compliment on page 382, lines 125-6.

297.437. *When thou ranst mad for the death of Horatio*. The editor says: "There were two plays in which Jeronymo appears. One is *The Spanish Tragedy*, and the other, earlier, is referred to by Jonson in the Introduction to *Cynthia's Revels* as 'Hieronimo as it was first acted.'" These are not two plays, for Jonson is referring to Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* as it was before "additions" were made to it by later writers. Jonson himself, in 1601, was hired to make such additions. The editor makes the same confusion in his note to 321.176.

313.50-4. *Fannius his play-dresser, who cut an innocent Moore i' th middle, to serve him in twice*. Professor Penniman says: "We do not know what Dekker refers to when he says that Jonson 'cut an innocent Moore i' th middle' etc." Dekker does not accuse Jonson of this, but himself. Professor Penniman adds: "Mr. Fleay offers the only plausible explanation thus far discovered," and quotes Fleay's theory that Dekker had "patched up the play" of *Stukeley* "with half of one by Peele on the Moor Mahomet." But this theory is not very plausible, for the passage seems to mean that Dekker took a single play, made it into two, and thus served it in twice; in *Stukeley* we have two plays condensed into one.

317.56. The editor's note indicates that he did not understand this passage; the latter part of his note is wholly ir-

relevant. Sir Vaughan dubs his man "Peter Salamander" because of Peter's violent red nose and face—a frequent make-up for the Elizabethan clown, for example, Bardolph in *Henry IV*.

326.316. *Alexas Secrets*. "Alexas is an attendant on Cleopatra in *Antony and Cleopatra*. The reference is perhaps to the scene with the Soothsayer (I. ii)." But Shakespeare is supposed not to have written *Antony and Cleopatra* until 1607-8.

328.346. Tucca, speaking of Horace-Jonson, says: "He love the little atheist." The editor comments: "Actors were regarded by many (e. g. Gosson) as immoral and profligate characters." However true this may be in general, it hardly applies here. Dekker is not satirizing Jonson as an actor; instead he is taking up the cudgels for the actors against their enemy Jonson. Apparently Dekker is referring to Jonson's religion, or is trying to brand him with atheism. Note that the charge is repeated, p. 394, l. 10: "That *hereticall* libertine Horace."

340.165-6. *banisht thee into the Ile of Dogs*. The word "banisht" and Tucca's habit of referring to famous plays make it almost certain that he is here glancing at Nash's *Isle of Dogs*.

349.128-30. *Thou'll shoot thy quills at me wilt not, porcupine?* Topsell, in *The History of Four-footed Beasts* (1608), p. 588, says that the porcupines shoot their quills "with such violence that many times they stick into trees."

358.106-7. *Like the poore fellow under Ludgate*. The editor's note about the debtors' prison is not to the point. Dekker probably refers to a particular beggar at Ludgate, and not to the general practice of prisoners begging through the grates, which, according to Thomas Heywood, had been rendered unnecessary at Ludgate by the generosity of Agnes Foster. See Heywood, ed. 1874, I. 277, 380.

358.126. *Peter is never burnt*. A pun, referring to (1) the fact that salamanders are not injured by flames, and (2) the French disease.

358.130-1. *That's treason: clip? horrible treasons*. The note should explain that to "clip" meant to mutilate the coin of the realm by paring the edges.

361.210. *When*. "Used absolutely, meaning 'ready,' 'now,' 'then!'" Dr. Scherer says: "When=vorwärts." The word was used merely as an expression of impatience. Cf. *Julius Caesar* II. i. 5.

375.54. *mystery*. Professor Penniman explains this as a pun: "A 'mystery' was a play based on a subject taken from the Bible." But the word "mystery" in this sense seems to have been first used in England by Dodsley in his Preface to his collection of *Old Plays*, 1744. See E. K. Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage* II. 105, and A. W. Pollard, *English Miracle Plays*, xix-xx.

382.137. *Call in that selfe-creating Horace*. For "selfe-creating" read "self-created" ? Cf. p. 387, ll. 269-70.

388.283. *impudentlie*. An error for "impudentlie," which is correctly printed in the quarto.

388.294. *Thee*. Read "the."

390.340-1. *Sit in a gallery*. "The gallery was the best place in the theatre, the price of admission being commonly two-pence." The price of admission to the "best place" in the theatre was at this time (1601) more than two-pence. It is probable that two-pence admitted one to the topmost gallery, but for the best places in the other galleries, six-pence, a shilling, and even more was charged. The editor was probably misled by Dr. Scherer's comment. He states the facts correctly in his note to 75.238.

395.142-3. *Good lord blesse me out of his majesties celler*. For "celler" read "coller" i. e. choler. Cf. 306.159,161.

Although Professor Penniman by his Notes has added much to the elucidation of *Satiromastix*, the play presents unusual difficulties, and needs close scrutiny by many scholars. I hope shortly to publish in a separate article additional notes to both plays, which my study of this edition has suggested, and which could not be given here without unduly lengthening this review.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

Cornell University.

THE MIDDLE ENGLISH PENITENTIAL LYRIC, by
Frank Allen Patterson. The Columbia University Press,
New York, 1911; pp. IX and 203.

The Middle English Penitential Lyric, by Dr. Frank Allen Patterson, which appears as one of the Columbia University Studies in English, is an important contribution to the history of early religious verse. The book is divided into three parts: an introduction, of forty-five pages; a corpus of texts, of one hundred and eight pages; and forty-six pages of notes and bibliography.